Claims 1-6, 9-16 and 19-30 are pending. By this Amendment, Claims 1, 3, 11, 13, 21 and 23 are amended. Claims 7-8, 17-18 and 31-36 were previously canceled.

Claim Objections

In the Office Action, the Examiner objects to Claims 1, 11 and 21. Various amendments to these claims obviate the objection, and withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 USC §102

Claims 1-6, 9-16 and 19-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by He (US 2004/0,118,916). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

He captures an image of an object and captures an ID (identification) from an RFID tag, and consults a database to determine whether the object and the ID match. If they do match, then the ID identifies the object in the captured image. If they don't match, then the ID identifies a different object than the (mystery) object in the captured image, and the object in the captured image remains un-identified. Thus He either identifies the object in the captured image or identifies a different object not shown in the captured image. See, for example, He's Abstract, He's numbered paragraphs [0008], [0049], [0061], [0062], and He's Claim 1.

Accordingly, He fails to disclose or suggest identifying two objects in an image, and also fails to disclose or suggest identifying the second object using a library narrowed based on an identifier of the first object, as variously encompassed by the independent claims.

In particular, He discloses using an imaging system to verify RFID reads. He's system captures an image of an object and also an ID from an RFID tag, and then compares both the image and the captured ID to known image/ID pairs in a database. If there is a match, then the

Type of Response: Amendment
Application Number: 10/659,121
Attorney Docket Number: 305228.01
Application Filing Date: September 10, 2003

8/11

captured ID from the RFID matches the object in the captured image. If there is not a match, for example if the captured ID matches an ID stored in the database but the stored image associated with the stored ID from the database does not match the captured image, then either the captured ID belongs to an object different from the object of the captured image, or the database pairing of stored ID with stored image is incorrect.

Since He identifies only one object, and further fails to disclose identifying a second object having a different identifier based on an identifier of the first object, He fails to disclose or suggest "*receiving an a first identifier, responsive to the requesting operation, the first identifier identifying the first object in the image; and identifying a second object in the image using a library of potential matches narrowed based upon the identity first identifier of the first object, the second object being identified by a second identifier that is different from the first identifier*", as recited in Claim 1, and similar features recited in independent Claims 11 and 21.

Accordingly, He fails to disclose or suggest independent Claims 1, 11 and 21.

With respect to Claims 3, 13 and 23, the Examiner has misinterpreted the claim language. The "one of" language does not refer to both delegate object and identifier, but instead indicates that "*at least one of the objects is a delegate object*". The feature of "*the identifier of the delegate object is received from another object*" is an additional and separate feature, not an alternative feature. Accordingly, the Examiner's interpretation of Claim 3 that omits or ignores the feature of "*the identifier of the delegate object is received from another object*" is improper and incorrect.

As previously noted, He does not disclose that an identifier of a delegate object received from another object. This is described at least on page 6, lines 17–24 of the instant application. In one example provided in the specification, a desktop computer provides data concerning attached peripherals including a keyboard, a mouse, and a printer. Accordingly, He fails to disclose or suggest the feature "*the identifier of the delegate object is received from another*

object" recited in Claim 3, and similar features recited in Claims 13 and 23. Accordingly, He fails to disclose or suggest dependent Claims 3, 13 and 23 for at least this reason.

The dependent claims depend variously from allowable independent Claims 1, 13 and 23, and are therefore likewise allowable for at least the same reasons.

For at least the above reasons, withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 1–6, 9–16 and 19–30 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over He is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration on the merits and prompt allowance are respectfully requested. In the event any questions arise regarding this communication or the application in general, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Type of Response: Amendment
Application Number: 10/659,121
Attorney Docket Number: 305228.01
Application Filing Date: September 10, 2003

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicants hereby request any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee that is not covered by an enclosed check please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-0463.

Respectfully submitted,
Microsoft Corporation

Date: March 23, 2009   By: /M. David Ream/

M. David Ream, Reg. No. 35,333
Attorney for Applicants
Direct telephone (425) 538-5530
Microsoft Corporation
One Microsoft Way
Redmond WA 98052-6399

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION

(Under 37 CFR § 1.8(a)) or ELECTRONIC FILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being electronically deposited with the USPTO via EFS-Web on the date shown below:

  March 23, 2009   /Rimma N. Oks/
Date   Rimma N. Oks

Type of Response: Amendment
Application Number: 10/659,121
Attorney Docket Number: 305228.01
Application Filing Date: September 10, 2003

11/11